

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

SANDRA LADIK, PENNY PERKINS,
JACKIE GOEBEL, MARIE COGGINS
and SONDRRA STEEB-LAMB,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WAL-MART STORES, INC.,

Defendant.

ORDER

13-cv-123-bbc

Defendant Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. has filed a motion for leave to file separate motions for summary judgment with respect to each of the plaintiffs. Dkt. #56. In support of its motion, defendant argues that there is little factual overlap among the plaintiffs' claims and that "permitting separate motions for summary judgment will afford the parties and the Court the opportunity to address these distinct issues in a more efficient and readily presentable manner." Dkt. #57 at 3-4. Although the dissimilarity of plaintiff's claims might have been a ground for severing the cases under Fed. R. Civ. P. 20, I do not see how it is more efficient to have five motions for summary judgment instead of one. All that accomplishes is to require 15 briefs instead of three and to multiply by five the sets of proposed findings of fact. Although I understand that a combined brief will be longer than separate briefs, I do not see that as a reason for cluttering the docket sheet with five times

as many filings. Of course, the parties are free to organize their briefs and proposed findings of fact in a manner that allows the parties to address each claim individually.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that defendant Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.'s motion for leave to file multiple motions for summary judgment, dkt. #56, is DENIED.

Entered this 24th day of April, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge